

Interview Summary	Application No.		Applicant(s)	
	10/009,083		DECKNER ET AL.	
	Examiner		Art Unit	
	Sabiha Qazi		1616	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Sabiha N. Qazi (Examiner).

(3) Bridget Murray (Former Attorney).

(2) Kevin Johnson (Attorney).

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 04 February 2005.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1-36.

Identification of prior art discussed: _____.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: In order to advance the prosecution, the Examiner consulted with SPE Gary Kunz and called Bridget Murray to discuss the issues. Ms. Murray informed the Examiner that Kevin Johnson is the new Attorney of Record for this case. The Examiner then called Mr. Johnson. The Examiner requested to discuss the criticality of the invention, and the BASIC differences between the instant invention and the prior art. Mr. Johnson refused to answer any of the Examiner's questions..